1	2	3
6	Himachal Pradesh	3
7	Jharkhand	3
8	Karnataka	7
9	Kerala	5
10	Madhya Pradesh	37
11	Maharashtra	24
12	Manipur	5
13	Meghalaya	2
14	Mizoram	0
15	Nagaland	3
16	Orissa	4
17	Punjab	7
18	Rajasthan	6
19	Sikkim	3
20	Tamil Nadu	2
21	Tripura	3
22	Uttar Pradesh	24
23	Uttarakhand	1
24	West Bengal	2
	TOTAL :	296

Recommendations of major ports

588. SHRI GIREESH KUMAR SANGHI:

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY:

Will the Minister of SHIPPING be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Panel which was constituted in January, 2009, for increasing efficiency in major ports has submitted important policy recommendations for areas like port corporation, delegation of power, land use and captive use of port facilities, public-private partnership, dredging, environment and security clearance besides organizational matters;

(b) if so, what are the other recommendations and to what extent Government has implemented them;

(c) whether the panel had recommended to bar rival private ports from bidding; and

(d) if so, whether this would promote competition and check diversion of cargo?

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING (SHRI G. K. VASAN): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The other recommendations are Berthing policy, Equipment policy, Stevedoring policy, IT policy, Standardisation .policy, Investment policy. The recommendations have been examined and those found fit are being implemented.

(c) and (d) One of the recommendation of the Committee is that "A policy may be formulated not to allow a competitor private port to bid for terminals within a major port if such private port exists within a radius of 100 kms." As per the Report,'In the wake of liberalization and privatization many ports in the private sector have sprung up. These private ports, though commenced with small volume of cargo, have been emerging as big entities and posing direct threat to the major ports in close proximity. Further, these private ports are also competing for terminals within a major port under Public-Private Partnership (PPP) policy. This situation may ultimately lead to capturing of high value cargo by these private ports by operating within a major port and outside. This ultimately may entail monopolistic tendencies and act in a manner detrimental to the major port and general trade.'

Cost of commissioning hired Harbour Tugs by Mumbai Port Trust

589. SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA:

SHRI D. RAJA:

Will the Minister of SHIPPING be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Mumbai Port Trust Flotilla Workers Association has made out a detailed petition to the Board of Trustees of the Mumbai Port, wherein it has been pointed out that the cost of port operations by commissioning hired harbour tugs on contract basis would be more than that of commissioning the Port's own tugs and ongoing regular employees of the port;

(b) if so, whether the management of the port rejected the prayers of the Association; and

(c) if so, on which grounds?

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING (SHRI G. K. VASAN): (a) Yes, Sir. Mumbai Port Trust Flotilla Workers' Association has made out a petition to the trustees wherein they have claimed that the cost of operation of hired harbour tugs would be more than the cost of operation by purchase of the tug by the Port and operating them with regular employees. However, it is seen that the working given by the unions is not correct. This has been explained to them during the meetings held on this proposal and the correct working of comparative cost made by the Port's Financial Advisor & Chief Accounts Officer provided to them. The comparative cost clearly indicates hire of tugs is cheaper man the Port investing in new tugs and recruiting personnel to man and operate them. Further, the availability of hired tugs is higher and assured for 353 days in a year as compared to the Port's owned tugs and hence preferred to enable the port to provide competitive and quality services to the shipping.